In re Appln. of De Boursetty et al.
Application No. 10/539,456
Response to Final Office Action of April 1, 2008

Amendments to the Claims

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions and listings of claims in the application.

Claim 1 (currently amended): A method for communication between a first unit and a second unit via a telecommunications network, wherein the first unit comprises a first family of applications and a second family of applications having communication capacities on the network extending beyond communication capacities of the applications of the first family, the method comprising the steps of:

/a1/ executing in the first unit an application of the first family which was not downloaded from the second unit, the execution comprising posing a question to a user of the first unit;

/a2/ obtaining, by a confidence component belonging to the second family of applications, a statement of [[a]] said question ~~to be posed to a user of the first unit in the context of an execution of an application of the first family~~;

/b/ presenting the question by the confidence component via a user interface and capturing a response from the user by the confidence component; and

/c/ for at least one type of response from the user, transmitting from the confidence component to the second unit, via the network, at least one message identifying the question presented and indicating the response captured, said message being transmitted under conditions inaccessible to the applications of the first family.

Claim 2 (original): The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the question posed is identified in the message of step /c/ by including the question statement in said message.

Claim 3 (previously presented): The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein, for at least one other type of response reflecting a refusal of the user in relation to the question posed, the confidence component indicates the refusal to said application of the first family.

Claim 4 (previously presented): The method as claimed in claim 3, wherein, for the type of response reflecting a refusal of the user in relation to the question posed, the confidence component does not transmit the message of step /c/ to the second unit.

Claim 5 (previously presented): The method as claimed in claim 1, further comprising the step of validating the response of the user at the second unit on receipt of the message transmitted in step /c/ by making sure that said message has actually been transmitted under

In re Appln. of De Boursetty et al.
Application No. 10/539,456
Response to Final Office Action of April 1, 2008

conditions inaccessible to the applications of the first family.

Claim 6 (previously presented):   The method as claimed in claim 5, further comprising the step of returning, following validation of the user's response, a response message from the second unit to the confidence component via the network.

Claim 7 (previously presented):   The method as claimed in claim 6, wherein the confidence component indicates to said application of the first family the content of the response message received from the second unit.

Claim 8 (currently amended):   The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the statement of the question is indicated directly to the confidence component in step /a2/ by said application of the first family.

Claim 9 (currently amended):   The method as claimed in claim 8, wherein said application of the first family indicates an address of the second unit with the statement of the question in step /a2/.

Claim 10 (currently amended):   The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein step /a2/ comprises the following sub-steps:

/a2-1/ indicating from said application of the first family to the confidence component an address of the second unit and a request to be submitted in order to obtain the statement of the question from the second unit;

/a2-2/ transmitting the request from the confidence component to the indicated address via the network;

/a2-3/ retrieving the statement of the question at the confidence component from a response to the request returned by the second unit via the network.

Claim 11 (currently amended):   The method as claimed in claim 10, wherein the request is transmitted by the confidence component in sub-step /a2-2/ under conditions accessible to the applications of the first family.

Claim 12 (previously presented):   The method as claimed in claim 10, wherein the response to the request returned by the second unit further includes a reference, said reference being stored by the confidence component and then inserted into the message transmitted in step /c/ to identify the question posed.

In re Appln. of De Boursetty et al.
Application No. 10/539,456
Response to Final Office Action of April 1, 2008

Claim 13 (previously presented):   The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein said application of the first family is a program written in Java language, and the confidence component is incorporated in a virtual Java machine with which the first unit is provided.

Claim 14 (previously presented):   The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the applications of the second family have the capacity to access, via the network, at least one URL associated with the second unit and inaccessible to the applications of the first family.

Claim 15 (previously presented):   The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the applications of the first family are not capable of accessing the network.

Claim 16 (previously presented):   The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the applications of the first family have the capacity, in a determined transfer protocol, to access only a single remote site which does not comprise the second unit.

Claim 17 (previously presented):   The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein each request originating from an application of the second family transmitted on the network and destined for the second unit is forced to include a marking associated with the second family of applications.

Claim 18 (previously presented):   The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein each request originating from an application of the second family transmitted on the network and destined for the second unit is forced not to include a marking associated with the first family, said marking being included in at least some of the requests transmitted on the network and originating from applications of the first family.

Claim 19 (previously presented):   The method as claimed in claim 17, wherein the requests comprise HTTP requests, and the marking is inserted in the headers of the HTTP requests.

Claim 20 (currently amended):   A confidence software component for a first unit capable of communicating with a second unit via a telecommunications network, the first unit comprising a first family of applications and a second family of applications having communication capacities on the network extending beyond communication capacities of the applications of the first family, wherein the confidence component belongs to the second

4

In re Appln. of De Boursetty et al.
Application No. 10/539,456
Response to Final Office Action of April 1, 2008

family of applications and includes instructions to control the following steps in an execution of the component in the first unit:

/a1/ executing in the first unit an application of the first family which was not downloaded from the second unit, the execution comprising posing a question to a user of the first unit;

/a2/ obtaining a statement of [[a]] the question to be posed to a user of the first unit in the context of an execution of an application of the first family;

/b/ presenting the question via a user interface and capturing a response from the user; and

/c/ for at least one type of response from the user, transmitting to the second unit, via the network, at least one message identifying the question presented and indicating the response captured, said message being transmitted under conditions inaccessible to the applications of the first family.

Claim 21 (currently amended): A communications terminal comprising means for communicating with a remote unit via a telecommunications network and hosting a first family of applications and a second family of applications having communication capacities on the network extending beyond communication capacities of the applications of the first family, wherein the second family of applications comprises a confidence component including instructions to control the following steps in an execution of the component:

/a1/ executing in the first unit an application of the first family which was not downloaded from the second unit, the execution comprising posing a question to a user of the first unit;

/a2/ obtaining a statement of [[a]] the question to be posed to a user of the communications terminal in the context of an execution of an application of the first family;

/b/ presenting the question via a user interface and capturing a response from the user; and

/c/ for at least one type of response from the user, transmitting to the remote unit, via the network, at least one message identifying the question presented and indicating the response captured, said message being transmitted under conditions inaccessible to the applications of the first family.